



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/720,943	03/12/2001	Brigitte Wittmann-Liebold	101215-52	8319
27387	7590	11/16/2004		
NORRIS, MCLAUGHLIN & MARCUS, P.A. 875 THIRD AVE 18TH FLOOR NEW YORK, NY 10022			EXAMINER NOGUEROLA, ALEXANDER STEPHAN	
			ART UNIT 1753	PAPER NUMBER

DATE MAILED: 11/16/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/720,943

Applicant(s)

WITTMANN-LIEBOLD ET AL. *HL*

Examiner

ALEX NOGUEROLA

Art Unit

1753

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 August 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5 and 9-32 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 29 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5, 9-28 and 30-32 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 12 March 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Status of the Objections and Rejections Pending since the Office action of February 20, 2004

1. All previous objections and rejections are withdrawn.

Claim Objections

2. Claims 14, 16, and 19 are objected to because of the following informalities:
 - a) Claim 14, line 6: -- and -- should be inserted before “recesses”;
 - b) Claim 16, line 5: -- the -- should be inserted before “rear” and also before “cover” ;
 - c) Claim 19, line 18: “and” should be deleted; and
 - d) Claim 24, line 5: “allow” should be -- allowing --.
3. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. Note that dependent claims will have the deficiencies of base and intervening claims.

5. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

6. Claims 9-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claims contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventors, at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Claim 9 requires the core to have two sides with each side comprising cooling elements. No support has been found or cited for such cooling elements. Applicants' Figure 1, for example, shows a core having two sides; however, the cooling elements are in the center of the core and not in each side. See Figure 2. Even if the left and right edges of the internal core shown in Figure 2 are construed as "sides" there is only one cooling element in each side.

7. Claims 9-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for at least two inner gel plates, does not reasonably provide enablement for one inner gel plate. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make the invention commensurate in scope with these claims. Claim 9 requires the core to have two sides with each side comprising cooling elements and each cooling element to make contact with an inner plate. Claim 9, though, only requires *at least* one inner plate and at least one outer plate, so if there is only one

inner plate then the each cooling element on at least one side of the core must somehow go around the outer plate to reach the inner plate. As Applicant's disclosure only enables an internal core having cooling elements (Figure 1) one with ordinary skill in the art would not be enabled to make an embodiment having one inner plate and cooling elements on both sides of the core that will contact this inner plate.

8. Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventors, at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Claim 15 requires the core to have two sides with each side comprising cooling elements. No support has been found or cited for such cooling elements. Applicants' Figure 1, for example, shows a core having two sides; however, the cooling elements are in the center of the core and not in each side. See Figure 2. Even if the left and right edges of the internal core shown in Figure 2 are construed as "sides" there is only one cooling element in each side.

9. Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for at least two inner gel plates, does not reasonably provide enablement for one inner gel plate. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make the invention commensurate in scope with these claims. Claim 15 requires the core to have two sides with each side comprising cooling elements and each cooling element to make contact with an inner plate. Claim 15,

though, only requires one inner plate and one outer plate, so if there is only one inner plate then the each cooling element on at least one side of the core must somehow go around the outer plate to reach the inner plate. As Applicant's disclosure only enables an internal core having cooling elements (Figure 1) one with ordinary skill in the art would not be enabled to make an embodiment having one inner plate and cooling elements on both sides of the core that will contact this inner plate.

10. Claims 15 and 19-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for separating mixtures of biomolecules in solution, does not reasonably provide enablement for separating a gel or other solid polymer composition. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims. Claim 15 is directed to an electrophoresis apparatus. Claim 19 is directed to an electrophoresis method. Electrophoresis is the separation of charged particles in solution using an electric field. Applicant's specification only describes using the electrophoresis apparatus to perform two-dimensional electrophoresis using buffer solutions, that is, electrophoresis is performed in solution. One with ordinary skill in the art would not know how to adapt Applicant's originally disclosed invention to perform electrophoresis on a sample that is a *gel* or a solid polymer.

11. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

12. Claims 1-5, 9-22, 24-28, and 30-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention:

- a) Claim 1, lines 2-3: how can a first thing (biomolecule) comprise a second thing (solution or gel) that comprises the first thing?
- b) Claim 1, line 4: the examiner suggests that the phrase -- having an electrophoresis combination chamber -- be inserted between "apparatus" and "permitting" so that it will be clear that the electrophoresis combination chamber is not a second electrophoresis apparatus. If the suggested phrase is inserted then in line 10 "an" should be replaced with -- the --;
- c) Claim 1, lines 14-15: "the electrophoretic separation" should be in the active voice. For example, the clause "the electrophoresis separation in the first dimension is carried out" could be replaced with -- electrophoretically separating the biomolecule mixture in the first dimension --;

- d) Claim 1, lines 19-20: "the electrophoretic separation" should be in the active voice. For example, the clause "the electrophoresis separation in the second dimension is carried out" could be replaced with -- the biomolecules are electrophoretically separated in the second dimension --;
- e) Claim 2 recites the limitation "the proteins" in line 3. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim;
- f) Claim 4, line 2: should "and" and "cast" be exchanged?
- g) Claim 9, lines 9-10: in line 9 "electrodes," should be replaced with -- electrodes -- and in line 10 "wherein" should be replaced with -- and --;
- h) Claim 10, line 4: -- lines -- should be inserted between "(12)" and "and" (support may be found in the first paragraph on page 12 of the specification);
- i) Claim 15 recites the limitation "the mixture" in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim;
- j) Claim 16, line 3: "with" should be replaced with --, comprising --;
- k) Claim 16, line 5: -- the -- should be inserted before "rear" and also before "cover";

l) Claim 17 should be rewritten as

-- The combination chamber according to Claim 16 further comprising

an upper part for the performance of IEF-electrophoresis in the first dimension,

a lower part for the performance of the SDS-electrophoresis in the second dimension, and

electrodes for electrophoresis in the first dimension,

wherein

the plates are sealed off to the outside by means of seals positioned in between the plates,

the seals extend along the length of the plates, and wherein

the rear wall plate is made of ceramic or glass and cover plate is a transparent plate. --

n) Claim 18, lines 1-7: as currently written this claim requires the rear wall plate to form "an assembly comprising the plates (28A, 28B)";

o) Claim 18, lines 1-6: because of "and" in line 4 it is not clear whether the rear wall plate also forms the buffer filling vessel of line 6 or whether the buffer filling vessel is a separate further element of the combination chamber;

- p) Claim 18: how is the assembly of line 6 related to what the rear wall plate forms in lines 3-6?
- q) Claim 18 recites the limitation "tank" in line 9. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim;
- r) Claim 18, line 10: does the seal actually change (*extend*) the widths of the plates?
- s) Claim 18, line 10: it is not clear how the electrodes are related to the removable seal;
- t) Claim 19, line 4: "where" should be replaced with -- the method comprising the steps of --;
- u) Claim 19, line 7: or other _____?
- v) Claim 19, line 8: "or applied to the IEF-gel and" should be deleted;
- w) Claim 19, lines 8-9: there should be a separate step of -- performing electrophoresis in the first dimension --;
- x) Claim 19, line 11: what is the object of "for" ("for of");

- y) Claim 19, line 12: "wherein the DS-gel and IEF-gel are"?
- z) Claim 20 recites the limitation "the recess" in line 3. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim;
- aa) Claim 21 recites the limitation "the cooling elements" in line 3. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim;
- ab) Claim 21 recites the limitation "the core" in line 6. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim;
- ac) Claim 22, line 2: should "biomolecule" be deleted?
- ad) Claim 22 recites the limitation "a recess in the IEF-gel" in line 3. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim;
- ae) Claim 24, line 2: is "gel-polymerised" meant to modify something? It appears to be used as an adjective;
- af) Claim 24, line 6: what undergoes "subsequent re-hydration"? Nothing has been dehydrated;

- ag) Claim 24, line 6: should "subsequent re-hydration" be -- subsequently re-hydrating --;
- ah) Claim 24, lines 6-7 require a buffer "comprising 1-4% of ampholines, yielding a pH-range of 2-11. This appears to be inconsistent with the preceding limitations an immobiline gel with low pK and an immobiline gel with high pK. Also, it is not clear if all three gel layers will be re-hydrated with the 1-4% ampholines;
- ai) Claim 25 requires the immobiline to comprise acrylamide *and* immobiline;
- aj) Claim 25: is immobiline gel different from immobiline that comprises acrylamide?
- ak) Claim 28: which gel is dried?
- al) Claim 32 recites the limitation "the inner and outer plates" in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

13. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Art Unit: 1753

14. Claim 23 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Hahn et al. (US 4,142,960) ("Hahn").

See col. 2, ll. 41-59 and col. 3, ll. 10-21.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

15. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

16. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

17. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out

Art Unit: 1753

the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

18. Claims 1, 2, and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hochstrasser (US 4,874,490) ("Hochstrasser") in view of Scott (US 5,192,408) ("Scott"), Danby (US 4,929,329) ("Danby"), and the JPO abstract of Kiyama et al. (JP 08-105858 A) ("Kiyama").

Addressing claim 1, Hochstrasser discloses a method for two-dimensional separation of mixtures of biomolecules or other substances (abstract) wherein the biomolecules comprise a solution comprising biomolecules (col. 1, ll. 10-36) in an electrophoresis apparatus permitting simultaneous use of two chambers for preparing and performing electrophoresis of two dimensional gels, the method comprising

casting a first gel for the separation in the first dimension (col. 3, ln. 67 – col. 4, ln. 2 and col. 4, ll. 19-20) and casting a second gel for the separation in the second dimension (col. 3, ll. 55-58), wherein the first gel and the second gel are arranged in succession or simultaneously vertical to one another (Figure 2 and col. 3, ln. 49 – col. 4, ln. 20), wherein casting the first gel and second gel are performed within the electrophoresis combination chamber (Figure 2 and col. 3, ln. 49 – col. 4, ln. 20), and the first gel is separated from the second gel by a seal (col. 3, ll. 59-60),

adding buffer solution followed by adding a biomolecule mixture that is deposited onto the first gel and performing an electrophoresis separation in the first dimension (col. 5, ll. 13-20),

removing the seal (col. 4, ll. 19-57, especially lines 22-24, 26-28, 39-42, 46-48, and 49-53) and adding a contact gel solution between the first gel and second gel (col. 5, ll. 31-44), wherein after the contact el solution polymerizes buffer solutions are filled in and electrophoresis separation in the second dimension is carried out (col. 5, ll. 47-55).

Hochstrasser does not mention a *hollow* seal; however, Hochstrasser does disclose that the seal may be gas, liquid or solid (col. 2, ll. 30-34) and in particular discloses using a flexible solid material such as a strip of rubber as the seal (col. 4, ll. 48-50). Barring evidence to the contrary, such as unexpected results, using a hollow tube as a seal, such as a rubber or polymer tube, instead of a solid rubber or polymer strip is just substitution of an art recognized equivalent structure. As shown by Scott (Figure 3 and col. 65-68) and Danby (col. 5, ll. 4-9) it was known at the time of the invention to use a hollow tube to act a liquid seal in a gel electrophoresis apparatus.

Hochstrasser does not mention the temperature profile during the first or second electrophoresis; however, it was known at the time of the invention that the temperature can significantly affect the quality of the separation. Also, temperature control means for slab electrophoresis devices were known at the time of the invention. For example see Kiyama. It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use a cooling means as taught by Kiyama in the invention of Hochstrasser because then temperature profile, such as constant temperature or a fixed temperature gradient, can be selected to optimize the separation.

Hochstrasser does not mention removing buffer solution; however, this will just depend on whether the same buffer used in the first dimension separation is also suitable for the second dimension separation.

Addressing claim 2, although Hochstrasser is silent as to whether the first and second electrophoreses are preformed vertically or horizontally, Hochstrasser does disclose that conventional slab gel electrophoresis cells may be used (col. 3, ll. 47-63). There is nothing to suggest that the combination chamber of Hochstrasser must be used just vertically or horizontally. Furthermore, since both vertical and horizontal slab electrophoresis cells were well known at the time of the invention, barring a contrary showing, the choice of performing the first electrophoresis vertically and the second electrophoresis horizontally is essentially arbitrary.

Addressing claim 5, although Hochstrasser discloses using specially formed spacers for varying the gel thickness (col. 3, ll. 23-30).

19. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hochstrasser (US 4,874,490) ("Hochstrasser") in view of the JPO abstract of Kiyama et al. (JP 08-105858 A) ("Kiyama"), Scott (US 5,192,408) ("Scott"), and Danby (US 4,929,329) ("Danby").

Addressing claim 9, Hochstrasser discloses a device for the two-dimensional separation of biomolecules or other substance molecules in gel by means of electrophoresis in an electrophoresis apparatus comprising electrodes (abstract; Figure 3; and col. 5, ll. 45-55),

wherein

an electrophoresis combination chamber comprising a core and having two sides

(Figure 1)

the electrophoresis combination chamber further comprising at least one inner gel plate and at least one outer gel plate (Figure 1), wherein the proximity of the inner gel plate and the outer gel plate defines a space for casting gels and buffer reservoirs (Figures 2 and 3).

Hochstrasser does not mention cooling elements. In particular, Hochstrasser does not mention cooling elements on both sides of the core and in contact with

cooling elements

Allowable Subject Matter

20. Claim 29 is allowed.

21. Claims 16 and 24 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, set forth in this Office action.

22. Claims 3, 17, 18, 25-28, and 30-32 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, set forth in this Office action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

23. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

a) Claim 3: the nonobvious limitation in the combination of limitations is at least the requirement "that the first gel of the first dimension is cast as a flat gel in a U-shaped tube."

In Hochstrasser the first gel is cast between two plates as a flat straight strip. See Figure 2 and col. 4, ll. 3-20.

b) Claim 4: the nonobvious limitation in the combination of limitations is at least the requirement of a sealing gel.

While Hochstrasser does disclose a sealing gel this is as an alternative to a solid polymer or rubber seal. See col. 4, ll. 33-48 and col. 4, ll. 48-57.

c) Claim 16: the nonobvious limitation in the combination of limitations is at least the requirement of at least two deflection elements between the rear wall plate and cover plate for guiding isolating elements in the form of a hollow seal.

In Porteous (WO 91/10901) the combination chamber is not configured for performing two-dimensional separation and the deflection elements (15) are for guiding the gel trays (12). See page 4, lines 6-23.

In Mullaart et al. (US 5,562,813) the gels are arranged vertically and are at the same level, that is, no gel is above another gel. See Figures 1 and 3.

- d) Claims 17 and 18 depend from allowable claim 16;
- e) Claims 24 and 29 require a sandwich arrangement of gels comprising two outer layers of immobilized gel and an intermediate layer comprising acryl amide gel in contact with the two outer layers. In Faupel et al. (US 5,082,548) there is no intermediate gel layer between the immobilized gels in containers 5 and 12 (Figure 8 and col. 3, ln. 46 – col. 6, ln. 24). Container 8, which is intermediate containers 5 and 12, is a flow cell into which the mixture to be separated is introduced (abstract);
- f) Claims 25-28, 30, and 31 depend directly or indirectly from allowable claim 24; and
- g) Claim 32: the nonobvious limitation in the combination of limitations is at least the requirement that the first gel be a preformed gel that is placed between the inner and outer plates and rehydrated. In Hochstrasser the first gel is made in situ between the inner and outer plates. See col. 3, ll. 67-68. It would not have been obvious to use preformed gel in the method of Hochstrasser as the device of Hochstrasser is specially

designed so the that the first and second gels can be cast and used in the same device, thus avoiding having to handling gels. See col. 2, ll. 4-12 and col. 2, ll. 34-39.

Final Rejection

24. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new grounds of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Art Unit: 1753

25. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ALEX NOGUEROLA whose telephone number is (571) 272-1343. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30 - 5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, NAM NGUYEN can be reached on (571) 272-1342. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Alex Noguera
Primary Examiner
AU 1753
November 3, 2004